

Appl. No. 09/601,010  
Amdt. Dated August 4, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0090  
Customer No.: 26021

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-60 were pending in the Application. By this amendment, claims 2-7, 9-15, 17-37, 42, 45, 46, 48, 49 and 52-57 are being cancelled, and claims 1, 8, 41, 43, 44, 47, 51, 58 and 60 are being amended. No new matter is involved.

In Paragraph 2 which begins on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-28, 36-50 and 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,609,424 of Sakuragi et al. In Paragraph 4 which begins on page 14 of the Office Action, claims 5, 12, 29-35 and 51-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakuragi et al. '424 in view of EP0849687 A2 (King). These rejections, which are essentially a repeat of the rejections made in the prior Office Action, are again respectfully traversed, particularly in view of the claims as amended herein.

As Applicant has previously pointed out, lines 55-67 of column 13 of Sakuragi, which are referred to in the Office Action, contain an explanation about the text registration routine represented by the flow chart in Fig. 19. Lines 1-14 of column 14 include an explanation about the tape width change. Lines 15-23 of column 14 describe an example in which the tape width is changed to 12 mm. Display is made of the inputted text data such as title, and the like. Lines 24-34 of column 14 include an explanation about the layout change, such as setting the type of line print provided, the inter-character pitch, and the like. Lines 35-49 of column 14 include an explanation about the registration process. As items to be registered, tape width, line layout data, and the like, are exemplified.

Thus, Sakuragi contains no disclosure or suggestion with respect to the layout change referred to in lines 24-34 of column 14 thereof, regarding the features in accordance with the present invention. Claim 1 defines an image printing method which includes "a regular printing instruction step of instructing regular

Appl. No. 09/601,010  
Amdt. Dated August 4, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0090  
Customer No.: 26021

printing for printing said regular character string, irrespective of whether or not a character string other than said regular character string is being input or edited". As amended herein, claim 1 further recites "wherein a plurality of types of regular character strings can be registered as said regular character strings", and further includes "a regular printing image selection step of selecting any one of said plurality of types of regular character strings as a regular character string to be printed by said regular printing". As amended herein, claim 1 still further defines the regular printing image selection step as including "an identifier display step of displaying a plurality of types of identifiers corresponding respectively to said plurality of types of regular character strings on a predetermined display screen", and "an identifier selection step of selecting any one of said plurality of types of identifiers". Therefore, claim 1 is submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art.

In independent claim 8 as amended, an image printing apparatus is defined which includes "regular printing instruction means for instructing regular printing for printing said regular character string, irrespective of whether or not a character string other than said regular character string is being input or edited", and "regular printing means for printing a regular character string image corresponding to said regular character string as a print image on a printing object when said regular printing is instructed". Amended claim 8 further recites "wherein a plurality of types of regular character strings can be registered as said regular character strings; and regular print image selection means for selecting any of said plurality of types of regular character strings as a regular character string to be printed by said regular printing." As amended, claim 8 further defines the regular print image selection means as including "identifier display means for displaying a plurality of types of identifiers corresponding to said plurality of types of regular

Appl. No. 09/601,010  
Amdt. Dated August 4, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0090  
Customer No.: 26021

character strings on a predetermined display screen" and "identifier selection means for selecting any of said plurality of types of indentifiers."

Sakuragi seems to have no idea at all of handling or treating the "regular character string" and "a character string other than a regular character string" separately so that regular printing is instructed to print the regular character string irrespective of whether or not the character string other than the regular character string is being input or edited".

Sakuragi neither discloses nor suggests an important feature in accordance with the invention, which, as described at line 19 of page 4 through line 1 of page 5 of the specification, is stated in part:

"...it is possible to register beforehand a character string including one or more characters as a regular character string and instruct regular printing for printing the regular character string, irrespective of whether or not a character string other than the regular character string is being input or edited."

The feature includes the fact that the printing can be made "at a desired time point" (page 4, line 30).

Thus, the disclosure of Sakuragi could not enable one skilled in the art to attain the object in accordance with the present invention of providing an image printing method and apparatus which are capable of printing a regular character string image of registered regular character string at a desired time point through simple operations, irrespective of whether other character strings are being edited or not, while saving the capacity of a memory used for displaying images.

Regarding the attempted combination of Sakuragi and King in rejecting some of the claims, the attempted combination thereof does not overcome the failure of the attempted combination to disclose or suggest the advantageous features in

Appl. No. 09/601,010  
Amdt. Dated August 4, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0090  
Customer No.: 26021

accordance with the invention as set forth, for example, in independent claims 1 and 8.

As described above, claim 1 is being amended by adding the limitations of claims 2 and 3 thereto, with claims 2 and 3 being cancelled in view thereof. As so amended, claim 1 is submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art. Claims 4-7 are being cancelled in addition to claims 2 and 3.

Independent claim 8, which is being amended by adding the limitations of claims 9 and 10 thereto, is submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art for the reasons discussed above. Claims 9 and 10 are being cancelled in view thereof.

Claim 38, which depends from claim 8, is also submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art.

Claims 11-15 are being cancelled.

Claim 16 depends from and contains all of the limitations of claim 1, so as to also distinguish patentably over the art.

Claims 17-37 are being cancelled.

As noted above, claim 38 clearly distinguishes patentably over the art. Claims 39 and 40 depend from and contain all of the limitations of claim 38, so that such claims should also distinguish patentably over the art. Claim 41 is being amended to depend from claim 8, and as such, contains all of the limitations of claim 8 so as to also distinguish patentably over the art.

Claim 42 is being cancelled.

Claims 43 and 44 are being amended to depend from claim 8, as is claim 47, so that such claims are also submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art.

Claims 45 and 46 are being cancelled, as are claims 48 and 49.

Appl. No. 09/601,010  
Amdt. Dated August 4, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0090  
Customer No.: 26021

Claim 50 depends from claim 47, and claim 51 depends from claim 38, so that these claims are also submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art for the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

Claims 52-57 are being cancelled.

Claim 58 is being amended to depend from claim 8, and claim 59 depends from claim 58, and claim 60 is being amended to depend from claim 8, so that such claims are also submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art.

In conclusion, claims 1, 8, 9, 16, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 47, 50, 51, 58, 59 and 60 are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art for the reasons discussed herein. Therefore, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 as placing the Application in condition for allowance or alternatively in better form for appeal, and reconsideration and allowance in view thereof, are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6846 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/601,010  
Amdt. Dated August 4, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2004


Attorney Docket No. 81752.0090  
Customer No.: 26021

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please  
charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: August 4, 2004

By:

  
John P. Scherlacher  
Registration No. 23,009  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701